REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 6, 2006 has been received and carefully studied.

The Examiner requires a new title that is clearly indicate of the invention to which the claims are directed. By the accompanying amendment, the Examiner's suggestion for a new title has been adopted.

The Examiner rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner states that the terms "short-time" and "long-time" are relative terms, and that the specification does not provide a standard for determining the scope of these terms.

By the accompanying amendment, claim 5 has been amended to clarify the terms.

The Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Eguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,418,810; claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Eguchi et al. in view of Pocholle et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,077,750 and Keller et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,007,059; and claim 5 as being unpatentable over Eguchi et al. in view of Pocholle et al. and Keller et al., and further in view of Morrow, U.S. Patent No. 5,172,264. The Examiner states that Eguchi et al. disclose a solid-state laser device that comprises first and second

resonators that share an optical axis and an output mirror, first and second light emitting units, a monitoring means and a control unit. With regard to claims 2-4, the Examiner admits that Eguchi et al. do not disclose monitoring and controlling the beams independently, but cites Keller et al. as teaching multiple monitoring means to monitor the beams to optimize mode locking, and cites Pocholle for its teaching of controlling the lasers independently. Regarding claim 5, Morrow is cited for its disclosure of using a pulsed and a continuous laser in combination.

The solid-state laser device of the present invention comprises two resonators for projecting laser beams coaxially, a first light emitting unit and a second light emitting unit for entering an excitation light to each resonator, monitor photodetectors for monitoring each laser beam projected from the resonators and a control unit for controlling the output of at least one of the first light emitting unit and the second light emitting unit based on signals from the monitor photodetectors. Therefore, it is possible to project the laser beam in different modes, e.g., a mode where laser beams of different wavelengths are projected, or a mode where pulsed wave forms are different.

By the accompanying amendment, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the control unit controls the projection of the first

laser beam and the second laser beam so that the laser beams are projected in different modes. Accordingly, for example, in the medical care field, in case the solid-state laser device is used in a surgical operation device using laser beams, as explained in the specification on page 4, line 12 et seq., it is possible to treat so that no damage results in the region other than the affected site by using laser beams with two wavelengths. Also, it is possible to treat using one wavelength and to perform fluorescence diagnosis using the other wavelength.

Eguchi et al. provide a device for detecting synchronously a part of a reflection light from a resonator and for outputting stably as a control signal of an electromagnetic actuator. Eguchi et al. do not have a device that comprises two resonators and projects two laser beams. Accordingly, Eguchi et al. do not disclose or suggest a control unit for controlling the output of at least one of a first light emitting unit and a second light emitting unit based on signals from two monitor photodetectors, and do not disclose or suggest output in different modes.

Regarding claims 2-5, these claims are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence, as Keller, Pocholle and Morrow do not supply the deficiencies of Eguchi et al. Furthermore, Although Keller describes mode locking, there is no disclosure regarding controlling a plurality of modes. In

Pocholle, a plurality of interference paths are composed of a plurality of light sources, and a part of the interference paths become common (see Figure 1). Pocholle does not detect respectively the laser beams from a plurality of light sources and does not control the light sources respectively. Accordingly, the combination of cited art does not disclose or suggest a control unit for controlling the output of at least one of the first light emitting unit and the second light emitting unit based on signals from the monitor photodetectors, or output control in different modes.

New claims 6-8 have been added to further define the invention.

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin S. Lemack
Reg. No. 32,579
176 E. Main Street - Suite 7
Westboro, Massachusetts 01581
TEL: (508) 898-1818